Court by the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. §§ 7402(b) and 7604(a)

26

27

28

and 28 U.S.C. § 1345.

Page 1 of 8

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 l

16 l

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 3. Venue is proper in the Southern District of California because David Reyes, Jr., ("Respondent") resides in this district.
- 4. At all times relevant, S. Silverman, who issued the summons to Respondent, was a Revenue Officer with the IRS, employed in the California Area, Long Beach Territory 1, Group 15, of the Small Business/Self-Employed Division of the IRS in San Diego, California.

  See Declaration of Revenue Officer S. Silverman at ¶ 1 ("Silverman Decl."). Revenue Officer S. Silverman was authorized to issue an IRS summons pursuant to the authority contained in 26 U.S.C. § 7602, and Treas. Reg. § 301.7602-1.
- 5. Respondent resides at 13500 Ginger Glen Road, San Diego, California, 92130, which is within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- On June 27, 2007, Revenue Officer Silverman issued two administrative summonses to Respondent, directing Respondent to appear before him on July 17, 2007, at 9:00 a.m. at 880 Front Street, San Diego, California, to give testimony and to produce for examination the documents and records specified in the summonses. The first summons, IRS Form 2039 ("Form 2039"), was issued to determine Respondent's ability to pay and concerned collection of his assessed The second income tax liability for the tax years 1999 to 2005. summons, IRS Form 6638 ("Form 6638"), seeks income tax return information for the unfiled tax years of 1995, 1996, 1998, and 2005. A copy of the summonses are attached to Officer Silverman's Declaration as Exhibit A. As detailed in this Petition, Respondent substantially complied with the first summons ("Form 2039") and the United States is not seeking enforcement of it. However, the United States is seeking enforcement of the second summons ("Form 6638") because to date, Respondent has not complied with this summons.

- 4. On June 29, 2007, Revenue Officer Silverman served both summonses by handing an attested copy of each to the Respondent.
- 5. On July 17, 2007, Respondent failed to appear. However, on this date, Revenue Officer Silverman received a telephone call from Steven Mopsick who said that he was Respondent's attorney and that he was in the process of gathering the necessary documents to prepare the tax returns and needed additional time till July 20, 2007, which Revenue Officer Silverman granted.
- 6. On July 20, 2007, neither Respondent nor his attorney Steven Mopsick contacted Revenue Officer Silverman. On July 25, 2007, Revenue Officer Silverman received some documents in partial compliance with the summonses from Mr. Mopsick via facsimile. However, the information was insufficient and not in full compliance with the summonses.
- 7. On October 12, 2007, Revenue Officer Silverman met with the Respondent at his office, who appeared in response to a "last chance" letter from the IRS Counsel's Office. During the meeting Respondent said he needed an extension and that "Powell and Associates" was preparing Respondent's tax returns. At this meeting Revenue Officer Silverman told Respondent that if the summonses were not complied with in two weeks, his case would be referred for enforcement.
- 8. On October 16, 2007, Revenue Officer Silverman spoke to Mr. Mopsick and granted another extension until October 31, 2007, for Respondent to provide the balance of the financial information and an extension until November 29, 2007, to have all the income tax information submitted. Ultimately, Respondent did comply with the financial statement summons (IRS Form 2039). However, Respondent still needs to comply with the income tax return information summons (Form 6638).

- 9. Shortly thereafter, due to the San Diego wildfires, all summons enforcement was placed on hold until January 2008. On December 6, 2007, per Mr. Mopsick's request, Revenue Officer Silverman granted another extension until January 2, 2008, to file all the returns and provide updated information. On January 7, 2008, Mr. Mopsick informed Revenue Officer Silverman that he was only acting as Respondent's power of attorney.
- 10. On February 11, 2008, Revenue Officer Silverman spoke to Respondent's live-in girlfriend or fiance, Julie Williams, who said that Respondent had his own business, Reyes Consulting. Revenue Officer has had no further contact with Respondent or anyone acting on behalf of Respondent.
- 11. All administrative steps required by the Internal Revenue Code for the issuance of the summons have been taken. Silverman Decl. at para. 14.
- 12. In order to obtain judicial enforcement of an IRS summons, the United States bears the initial burden of showing "that the investigation may be relevant to the purpose, that the information sought is not already within the Commissioner's possession, and that the administrative steps required by the Code have been followed . .
- United States v. Powell, 379 U.S. 48, 57-58 (1964); accord, United States v. Dynavac, 6. F.3d 1407 (9th Cir. 1993). The burden on the Government is a "slight one" and may be satisfied by presenting the declaration of the agent who issued the summons and is seeking enforcement. Id. (citing United States v. Abrahams, 905 F.2d 1276, 1280 (9th Cir. 1990) (other citations omitted)). Once a prima facie case has been made, "a 'heavy' burden falls on the taxpayer" to show an abuse of the court's process or lack of institutional good faith,

1 Dynavac,
2 and evider
3 v. United
4 omitted).
5 summary p:
6 p. 83,363
7 hearing,
8 States' p
9 defense.
10 1995).
11 13.
12 determine
13 tax years
14 14.
15 of a summ

17 I

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Dynavac, 6 F.3d at 1280, and respondent "must allege specific facts and evidence to support his allegations." Liberty Financial Services v. United States, 778 F. 2d 1290, 1292 (9th Cir. 1985) (citation omitted). This matter may be decided on the written record in a summary proceeding. Hotz v. United States, 96-1 USTC para. 50,097 at p. 83,363 (E.D. Calif. 1996). To be entitled to an evidentiary hearing, a respondent must make some showing to refute the United States' prima facie case or present facts supporting an affirmative defense. See Fortney v. United States, 59 F.3d 117, 121 (9th Cir. 1995).
- 13. Revenue Officer Silverman is conducting an investigation to determine Respondent's income tax return information for the unfiled tax years of 1995, 1996, 1998, and 2005. Silverman Decl. at para. 4.
- of a summons for the purpose of "determining the liability of any person for any internal revenue tax . . . or collecting any such liability . . . ." 26 U.S.C. §7602(a). Therefore, Revenue Officer Silverman's investigation is being conducted pursuant to a legitimate purpose specifically authorized by statute.
- 15. Further, the testimony, books, papers, records, or other data sought by the summons are not already in the possession of the IRS and the administrative steps required by the Code, including proper service, have been followed. Silverman Decl. at para. 13 and 14.
- 16. Respondent is in possession and control of the testimony and documents concerning the above-described investigation.
- 17. The Internal Revenue Code permits the Secretary to summon the records of any person "which may be relevant or material" to the

investigation. 26 U.S.C. § 7602(a)(1). It is well-settled that to satisfy the relevancy requirement set forth in <u>Powell</u>, the United States must demonstrate that the summoned information may throw light on the subject of the investigation. <u>Abrahams</u>, 905 F.2d at 1281; <u>United States v. Arthur Young & Co.</u>, 465 U.S. 805, 813-14, n. 11 (1984). This standard necessarily presents a low threshold because of the inherent difficulties in ascertaining, prior to examination, how much use the summoned records will be in determining the collectibility of a person's tax liability and whether a person has an income tax liability for a specific period. The Supreme Court has observed that:

[a]s the language of §7602 clearly indicates, an IRS summons is not to be judged by the relevance standards used in deciding whether to admit evidence in federal court . . The language 'may be' reflects Congress' express intention to allow the IRS to obtain items of even potential relevance to an ongoing investigation, without reference to its admissibility. The purpose of Congress is obvious: the Service can hardly be expected to know which data will be relevant until it is procured and scrutinized.

Arthur Young & Co., 465 U.S. at 814 (internal citation omitted) (emphasis in the original). This low threshold of relevance also follows from the language of the Code, which authorizes the investigation of persons who "may be liable" for taxes. 26 U.S.C. § 7601.

18. Under the instant circumstances, it is clear that the summoned material is relevant. The purpose of Revenue Officer Silverman's investigation is to determine Respondent's income tax return information for the unfiled tax years of 1995, 1996, 1998, and 2005. The Summons seeks, among other things, " . . . all bank statements, checkbooks, canceled checks, savings account passbooks, records, or certificates of deposit . . ." Silverman Decl. at

Exhibit A (Form 6638). The documents sought by this summons are clearly relevant to determine Respondent's income tax return information for the unfiled tax years of 1995, 1996, 1998, and 2005.

19. There is no Department of Justice referral for criminal prosecution in effect with respect to Respondent. Silverman Decl. at para. 16.

WHEREFORE, the United States requests that:

- 1. The Court enter an order directing Respondent, David Reyes, Jr., to show cause, if any, why he should not comply with and obey the above-described summons (Silverman Decl. at Exhibit A, Form 6638) served on him personally on June 27, 2007, and each and every requirement thereof, by ordering the attendance, testimony, and production of the books, papers, records, and other data required and called for by the terms of the summons before Revenue Officer S. Silverman, or any other proper officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service at such time and place as may be fixed by Revenue Officer Silverman or any other proper officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service.
- 2. That the United States recover the costs and expenses incurred in maintaining this action against Respondent.
- 3. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be required.

DATED: 5/29/08

KAREN P. HEWITT

United States Attorney

¢AROL M. LEE

Assistant U.S. Attorney

JS44

(Rev. 07/89)		CIVII	COV	ek shee i			*	
rules of court. This form, ap	nd the information contained herein proved by the Judicial Conference of NS ON THE SECOND PAGE OF T	of the United States in S	plement th September	e filing and service of 1974, is required for th	pleadings or ne use of the	Clerk of Court for the p	ed by law, except as propurpose of initiating the	ovided by local civil docket
I (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENI	DANTS		Ý	THE HERD	
UNITED	STATES OF AME	CRICA			DAVII		JRO PH 12: 4	
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDE LISTED PLAINTIPF (EXCEPT IN CASES)	ence of first <u>San</u> U.S. Plaintiff	Diego		(IN U.S. PLAN	INTIPP CA	SES ONLY)	TAICY OF CALIFO	(C. C. A. C.
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM	NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELES	PHONE NUMBER)	ATTORN	EYS (IF KNOWN)				
CAROL M. LEE 880 FRONT STRE SAN DIEGO, CA (619) 557-6235	92101-8893	, 5 - +			<b>'08</b>	<b>CV 0</b> 96	3 IEG CI	<b>∤</b> B
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (PLACE AN x IN O	NE BOX ONLY)		CITIZENSHIP OF I			AN X IN ONE BOX	DEFENDANT
10.S. Government Plaintiff	□3Federal Questio	on ent Not a Party)		n of This State	PT D	EF ], Incorporated		PT DEF
☐ 2U.S. Government	□4Diversity (Ind: Citizenship of Pa	State Place of Business in Another						
	Petition to E	nforce In	terna	al Revenu	e Ser	rvice Summ	nons //SC 75	102(6)
V. NATURE OF SUIT	PLACE AN X IN ONE BOX ON	NLY)						
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJU	TRY	PORPEITURE/PENA	ALITY D	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER ST	
Marine	310 Airplane	362 Personal In	rv-	☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 620 Other Food		422 Appeal 28 USC 423 Withdrawal 28	·	
Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Medical Malpract		3 625 Drug Related		PROPERTY RIGHTS	430 Banks a	
Negotiable Instrumen	L	□ 365 Personal In	jury -	of Property 21 U	SC881 🗀	820 Copyrights	450 Commerc	e/ICC
150 Recovery of	ant Liability	Product Liabilit	. [	G30 Liquor Laws	0	830 Patent 840 Trademark	460 Deporta	tion er Influenced
151 Medicare Act	2 340 Marine	Product Liabilit	у ј	☐ 650 Airline Rega	, _	SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Orga	nisations
152 Recovery of Loans (Excl. Veterans	345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPE	r	Coccupational 690 Other	. <u> </u>	861 HIA (13958)	B10 Selecti	ve Service
☐ 153Recovery of	350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Le		LABOR		862 Black Lung (92 863 DIWC/DIWW (405	Bychanca	
of Veterans Benefits	erans Benefits 355 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Perso		nal	710Fair Labor St	L	864 SSID Title XVI	B75 Custome	
160 Stockholders Suit Other Contract	360 Other Personal	385 Property Day		730 Labor/Mgmt.	lations	965 RSI (405(g)) PEDBRAL TAX SUITS	891 Agricul 892 Economi	
195 Contract Product			У	Disclosure Act		870 Taxes (U.S. or Defendant)	893 Environ	mental
210 Land Condemnation		510 Motions to		740 Railway Labo		871 IRS - Third Pa	H 894 Energy .rty D 895 Freedom	
220 Foreclosure	442 Employment	Habeas Corpus	Vacaca	790 Cther Baber 791 Empl. Ret. :		26 USC 7609	900 Appeal	
230 Rent Lease &	P 443	530 General	1	Security Act			Under Equal	Access to
240 Tort to Land	444 Welfare	535 Death Penal	ty				950 Constit	utionality of
245 Tort Product	440 Other Civil Rights	540 Mandamus &			1		B90 Other 8	tatutory
290 All Other Real		550 Civil Right						
VI. ORIGIN (PLACE	N X IN ONE BOX ONLY)				,			
Proceeding fr	2 Removal  3 Remand om State Appelate Co urt	urt Rein	stated eopened	(specify)		Multidistrict gation	O7 Appeal to I Judge from Magi Judgment	Lstrate
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS		Ē	EMAND \$		complaint	only if demands:	

DATE 5/30/08 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD CAROL M. LEE, AUS